IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON OBSIDIAN FINANCE GROUP, LLC,) and KEVIN D. PADRICK, Plaintiffs,) No. 3:11-cv-57-HA) May 29, 2012 vs. CRYSTAL COX,) Portland, Oregon Defendant. TELEPHONIC MOTION HEARING TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARCO A. HERNANDEZ UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES David S. Aman, via telephone FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Tonkon Torp, LLP 888 S. W. Fifth Avenue Suite 1600 Portland, OR 97204 COURT REPORTER: Nancy M. Walker, CSR, RMR, CRR United States District Courthouse 1000 S. W. Third Avenue, Room 301 Portland, OR 97204 (503) 326-8186

PROCEEDINGS

THE CLERK: Good afternoon. We're on the record in the case of Obsidian Finance Group, et al. versus Crystal Cox, Civil Case No. 11-57-HZ, on a motion hearing.

Counsel, please state your appearance for the record.

MR. AMAN: David Aman for plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Aman. This is

Judge Hernandez. We're here because I asked for a

hearing regarding your request to appoint a receiver in

this matter. I should note that both sides were advised

of today's date and time for the hearing. Ms. Cox sent a

rather extensive e-mail, as I understand it, letting the

Court know that she was not going to participate and did

not want to participate in this hearing.

I know that we had given her the opportunity up until now to change her mind; and if she had decided to change her mind, she merely needed to contact us and she would have been put into the phone call hearing this afternoon. We did not hear from her, so I'm assuming that she is continuing with her decision and her refusing to participate or her decision not to participate in this afternoon's hearing.

The e-mail will become part of the record. It

will be placed as part of the file, so anybody that wants to look at it can see what the details are. And the reasons for her declining to participate are stated in that e-mail.

Mr. Aman, we, in this chambers, had some questions for you regarding your request for a receiver in this matter. And is it still your desire to have the Court appoint a receiver?

MR. AMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So one of the -- right now my inclination is to deny your request for a receiver, but to allow you to refile it. And I want to take this opportunity to let you know what my concerns are.

MR. AMAN: Okay.

THE COURT: So the first question is: You need to explain to the Court why it is you actually need a receiver. From our perspective or my perspective, it seems to me that the domain names are property. I don't have any difficulty with the notion that they can be bought and sold and that you can garnish them or attach them or seize them and have them sold at a sheriff's auction. What is not clear to me is why you need a receiver in order to levy and execute upon a particular asset.

Secondly, what is not understood by me is how it

is that a receiver would be paid, where the money to pay the receiver would come from. It isn't addressed in your motion, and I would want to know the answer to that.

The third question I have has to kind of go back to my days as a state court judge; that is, any time I ever appointed a receiver, the receiver was not there to seize a particular asset for a particular individual or a particular judgment creditor. The receiver was there to represent the interests of all potential creditors.

And I'm not quite sure about the scope of the Court's authority to appoint a receiver to seize a particular asset in favor of a particular creditor as opposed to all creditors. I mean, it's my understanding that receivers are appointed by the Court. They have protection by the Court because they are the Court's -- kind of a quasi court official. And it's not clear to me why a receiver would then be working only on behalf of your client.

Also, it's not clear to me why they wouldn't be looking at any other creditor, for that matter, and any other asset, for that matter.

The next question that we have in our chambers is jurisdiction. We looked at the case that you cited arising out of the Ninth Circuit; and it looked to us that the location of the asset, when it comes to domain

names, is where the receiver should come from. And it's not clear to us that the domain names are located in Oregon. In fact, we're pretty sure they're not located in Oregon and that they actually are located in another jurisdiction; and it seems to us that the receiver probably needs to be appointed in that jurisdiction.

So as a procedural matter, at least as we look at it, what it seems you would have to do is take your judgment, register it in the foreign jurisdiction where those assets are located; and if it is appropriate to have a receiver appointed, it should occur there.

And so if you decide that you want to refile your request for a receiver, we would want you to address that particular issue and let us know why it is that Oregon is the right place for a receiver to be appointed, as opposed to the jurisdiction where the property is actually located, which is where the -- I suppose the company that handles the domain names is located.

Hang on a second. Let me see what else I've got for you.

MR. AMAN: Sure. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: (Pause) We then moved and started looking at the Oregon Rules of Civil Procedure 80 D and Oregon law on receivers. ORCP 80 D, subparagraph (1), requires that the order appointing a receiver contain a

reasonable description of the property included in the receivership. And here you're describing the property as domain names and any other similar assets. If you have other similar assets that are in mind, we think that a more detailed description would be better.

Also, under the Oregon rules, the order is to fix a time within which the receiver is supposed to file a report setting forth what the property is, what the interest in the property is. I remember when I was in state court, I used to get those reports on a quarterly basis usually, at a minimum. Sometimes I got them on a monthly basis, telling me what was going on with the property, who had interest in it, and how it was being handled. Those usually were included in the order for a receiver.

And then, finally, there's also a provision in 82 A that requires that receivers be appointed only upon the giving of a security. I think that you may have proposed a security amount of \$10,000. But again, it's unclear to the Court why that's a sufficient amount or what would be a sufficient amount. There isn't anything for me to judge that that's adequate or, for that matter, more than adequate. I have no idea how you came up with that number and why you believe that's the correct number in this particular case.

1 I'm going to put you on hold for a second -- my 2 staff has been taking notes -- and make sure I didn't 3 forget something. Hang on for just a moment. MR. AMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 (The Court and the law clerk confer off the 5 6 record.) 7 THE COURT: Mr. Aman, those are the points that I was concerned about, my chambers was concerned about. 8 9 Like I said, you'll get a minute order telling 10 you that your immediate motion is denied, with leave to 11 refile. And I would ask that you address those questions that I posed should you choose to refile your motion. 12 13 MR. AMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Okay. With that, we are in recess. 15 Thank you. 16 17 (Proceedings concluded.) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

--000--

I certify, by signing below, that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-titled cause. A transcript without an original signature, conformed signature or digitally signed signature is not certified.

/s/ Nancy M. Walker

8-9-12

DATE

NANCY M. WALKER, CSR, RMR, CRR Official Court Reporter Oregon CSR No. 90-0091